

Agenda 21 and Global Warming

**Club of Rome, World Wildlife Fund, Paul Ehrlich, John Holdren
by Jim Vanne**

As Blaise Pascal once noted, once science is divorced from ethics, scientists will use their skills to pursue *power*, not truth [1].

The following is a study on this exact issue. What is behind the global warming? The same thing that was behind the global cooling scare of the 1970s: The 1974 Club of Rome report titled, *Mankind at the Turning Point* stated, “The real enemy then, is humanity itself.”

Their solution was simple—engineer a massive reduction in population and utterly change the socio-economic system through centralized planning via total government control. This “man is the enemy” was reiterated by the Club of Rome in 1993, as well, when they stated in their [The First Global Revolution](#), downloadable at [scribd.com](#) that “In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill...All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself.”

“We came up with the idea??” In other words, scientific analysis didn’t drive this conclusion, but rather a conclusion had already been reached, and now they needed to create a “reason” to back their unsupported—and as Julian Simon provisionally demonstrated, possibly *false* - a priori assumptions. Do *not* try this technique in any school paper you may attempt, or you will be failed!

As Robert Zubrin observed, to the warmers, “... each new life is unwelcome, each unregulated thought or act is menace, every person is fundamentally the enemy of every other person, and each race or nation is the enemy of every other race or nation.” Perhaps it is put most clearly by the World Wildlife Fund Living Planet Report of 2012, which Lewis Page summarizes in the May 16, 2012 edition of the *Register* that “economic growth should be abandoned, (and) citizens of the world’s wealthy nations should prepare for poverty.”

The rich, of course, are especially bad, as the Education for Sustainable Development Toolkit, by Rosalyn McKeown, found at [esdtoolkit.org](#) tells us: “Generally, more highly

educated people who have higher incomes, consume more resources than poorly educated people, who tend to have lower incomes. In this case, more education increases the threat to sustainability.” Of course, individual rights are verboten, given the Malthusian threat to the earth. As Harvey Ruvin, Vice-chair of International Committee for Local Environment Initiatives (ICLEI), a group that wants to impose the green agenda on everyone has noted, “Individual rights must take a back seat to the collective.” Pol Pot, move over.

All this misses, of course, the simple dictum of Julian Simon: *“The most important benefit of population size and growth is the increase it brings to the stock of useful knowledge. Minds matter economically as much as, or more than, hands or mouths.”* This is the same Julian Simon that bet global coolers Paul Ehrlich and current-warmer-then-global cooler John Holdren that the price of chromium, copper, nickel, tin, and tungsten would go down, not up, by Sept. 29, 1990.

In fact, all five commodities—which Ehrlich selected - went down by the targeted date. In Oct. 1990, Ehrlich mailed Julian Simon a check for \$576.07 to settle the wager. No word if current unelected Obama science czar Holdren (a former global *cooling* fanatic) chipped in any dough or not. But—as the last refuge of scientific (or economic) scoundrels—of course, “this time will be different.” See [the Wikipedia](#) summary of this wager.

Of course, Ehrlich has *still* not gone away. In April, 2012, the Royal Society published *People and the Planet* [2]—calling for the West to be de-industrialized, as well as for a drastic reduction in population based on their demonstrably preposterous “modeling” analyses. Ehrlich states: “They (population and resources) multiply together. You have to deal with them together. We have too much consumption among the rich and too little among the poor. That implies that terrible thing that we are going to have to do which is to somehow redistribute access to resources away from the rich to the poor...you might be able to support in the long term about 4 or 5 billion people. But you already have 7 billion. So we have to humanely and as rapidly as possible move to population shrinkage.” [3]

And \$100 to first person who guesses who will be in charge of that redistribution process, as well as who will be exempted because they are “special” (and you can start with Nancy Pelosi and her exemption of herself, her district, and her union cronies from Obamacare, or ask Michelle Obama on her *next* uber-luxe vacation). Long story short, the Guardian reports that the Royal Society basically would like to sequester everyone on megacities to reduce material and energy consumption, as well as “systematically decoupling economic activity from environmental impact.” In sum, Agenda 21—see the Planet Under Pressure article at [planetunderpressure2012](#) for full details. Or as the chief scientist behind Planet Under Pressure, Michail Fragkias states, “the answer (to population growth) is denser cities.” Of course, the question presents itself as to whether these cities are meant to be Nazi-like ghettos, to allow better control of the sheeple.

But these people are not alone. Nutrition professor Anthony Costello of the Institute of Global Health (yes, *nutrition*) *stated in a* January 25 2011 lecture titled *Stabilising the global population: Where next for the Millennium Development Goals* that “climate denialism” in the US is “a major problem”, both culturally and politically, “that’s got to be addressed” and the phrase “climate skeptics” needs to be removed from the vocabulary when describing those not willing to go along with the disproved and debunked “climate change” hoax.

Rather, Costello argues, the phrase should be replaced by “climate denialists.” Here is Costello in his own words on [YouTube](#). And Costello then sets the stage as skeptics being the next terrorists by stating in 2010 during a [2010 Policy Symposium](#) on the Connection between Population Dynamics, Reproductive Health and Rights and Climate Change (page 5), that “climate skepticism kills.” I’m sure Mr. Costello “forgot” that various flavours of socialism killed perhaps up to 160 million last century, but no worries there! But as they say in the Ronco commercials, Wait!

There’s More! At a [UNESCO conference](#) in September of 2009 on how to best “communicate” the IPCC conclusions, 20-year BBC veteran environment reporter Alex Kirby compared climate-skeptics to Apartheid proponents (Session 1, 01:36:35): “I’ve never thought it is part of the journalists’ job to try to inject an artificial and spurious balance into an unbalanced reality. If I have been sent to do a story on Apartheid or poverty or starvation, I hope to God I would not have tried to do a balanced story. And I think the same applies to climate change.” [4]

Of course, this comment was omitted from the official transcript. Yep. Scientists trying to apply the scientific method are “killing people” and worse than apartheid supporters. Sociologist Kari Norgaard has written that “cultural resistance” to the concept of man-made climate change to be “recognized and treated” as abnormal behavior[5] (you are correct—homosexuality is good according to the APA, and using the scientific method to arrive at truth is now “abberant.”

And scientists asking real questions need to be “treated.” Meanwhile, University of Amsterdam philosopher Marc Davidson who in 2007 [wrote](#) that those who are skeptic about global warming equal those who defended slavery[6] while Andrew J. Hofman of the University of Michigan, wrote in [Climate change as a cultural and behavioral issue: Addressing barriers and implementing solutions](#) that “(...) the magnitude of the cultural and moral shift around climate change is as large as that which accompanied the abolition of slavery.”

In his paper Hofman also stressed that “humankind has grown to such numbers and our technologies have grown to such a capacity that we can, and do, alter the Earth’s ecological systems on a planetary scale. It is a fundamental shift in the physical order—one never before seen, and one that alters the ethics and morals by which we judge our behavior as it relates to the environment around us and to the rest of humanity that depends on that environment.” [7]

As the Daily Sheeple concluded, “Altering our ethics, altering our morals - that’ s exactly what Agenda 21 is all about- specifically and altering these ethics and morals to more “environmentally friendly” ones.” And don’ t expect this to be done openly or democratically, as the need is “too urgent” - though not urgent enough for the *elite* to have to change their lifestyles. Just google any leftist celebrity followed by the word “mansion” to see for yourself. Perhaps try Michael Moore, James Cameron, or global warming supporter John Travolta, who has *five* airplanes, with a home that doubles as an airport.

It may even be as bad—though examining conspiracy theories are not the goal of this article - as noted in the anonymously authored document *Silent Weapons for Quiet Wars* that there is a conscious effort of control through knowledge suppression and selective dissemination is reiterated in the book, where it states: “” ... the bookkeeper can be king if the public can be kept ignorant of the methodology of the bookkeeping. All science is merely a means to an end. The means is knowledge. The end is control.” Unfortunately, facts are a stubborn thing, and those darned deniers keep presenting facts so simple even a grade schooler can understand. Broken hockey stick, anyone?

This may sound conspiracy theory oriented, but even Alduous Huxley noted that “Under a scientific dictatorship, education will really work with the result that most men and women will grow up to love their servitude and will never dream of revolution. There seems to be no good reason why a thoroughly scientific dictatorship should ever be overthrown.”

The infamous Agenda 21 also is a new card in the warmer’ s deck. “Sustainable development” —who wouldn’ t want that? But global warming, as a subset of Agenda 21, is much more pernicious than that. First get the snout of the camel under the tent—and only later try to sneak in the ugly derriere as radical homosexual thinkers Madsen and Kirk advised several decades ago. As they say, “same diff” with global warming.

As a matter of fact, a policy paper entitled paper [The Next 40 Years: Transition Strategies to the Virtuous Green Path: North/South/East/Global](#) (full paper at unesdoc.unesco.org) by Dr. Jeffrey Sachs, presented at UN Conference on Environment and Development in 1991 outlined a course of action to occur over 35—40 years, culminating in what amounts to no more than an Orwellian socialist dictatorship (recall Nancy Pelosi stating, in answer to an environmental question, “Every aspect of our lives must be subjected to an inventory ... of how we are taking responsibility.”) The main thesis of the paper is Malthusian and redistributist, with a health slug of de-industrialization and depopulation of the West thrown in. A succinct summary of one of these seminal warmer works can be found at thedailysheeple.com

And given the history of Malthus in the whole scheme of things, who was this kindly old British reverend? As a matter of fact, he wasn’ t exactly kindly, writing: “Instead

of recommending cleanliness to the poor, we should encourage contrary habits. In our towns we should make the streets narrower, crowd more people into the houses, and court the return of the plague. In the country, we should build our villages near stagnant pools, and particularly encourage settlement in all marshy and unwholesome situations. But above all, we should reprobate specific remedies for ravaging diseases; and those benevolent, but much mistaken men, who have thought they were doing a service to mankind by projecting schemes for the total extirpation of particular disorders.” (Malthus, 412) .

Regarding children he stated “ “We are bound in justice and honour formally to disclaim the right of the poor to support. To this end, I should propose a regulation be made declaring that no child born’ should ever be entitled to parish assistance’ The [illegitimate] infant is comparatively speaking, of little value to society, as others will immediately supply its place’ All children beyond what would be required to keep up the population to this [desired] level, must necessarily perish, unless room be made for them by the deaths of grown persons.” (Malthus, 411, 430-1)[8]

Now, it may very well be that these statements, as victorianweb.org notes, were meant to be Swiftian *irony*. But whether or not that is the case, those that followed him are taking the “modest proposal” literally. So, to introduce the issue of global warming, you see where the self-appointed “elite” are coming from. Think of self-appointed “elite” (no, Mr. Brzezinski is no longer an appointed official) such as Zbigniew Brzezinski, who wrote “*The technotronic era involves the gradual appearance of a more controlled society. Such a society would be dominated by an elite, unrestrained by traditional values. Soon it will be possible to assert almost continuous surveillance over every citizen and maintain up-to-date complete files containing even the most personal information about the citizen. These files will be subject to instantaneous retrieval by the authorities.*”

Some other environmental apocalyptic quotes for your consideration:

- Best-selling economist Robert Heilbroner in 1974: “The outlook for man, I believe, is painful, difficult, perhaps desperate, and the hope that can be held out for his future prospects seem to be very slim indeed.”
- Best-selling ecologist Paul Ehrlich in 1968: “The battle to feed all of humanity is over. In the 1970s [“and 1980s” was added in a later edition] the world will undergo famines—hundreds of millions of people are going to starve to death in spite of any crash programs embarked on now ... nothing can prevent a substantial increase in the world death rate.”
- Jimmy Carter in a televised speech in 1977: “We could use up all of the proven reserves of oil in the entire world by the end of the next decade.”
- Philip Cafaro at Univ. of Colorado stated “Scientists now speak of humanity’ s increased demands and impacts on the globe as ushering in a new geological epoch: the Anthropocene. Such selfish and destructive appropriation of

the resources of the Earth can only be described as interspecies genocide...Ending human population growth is almost certainly a necessary (but not sufficient) condition for preventing catastrophic global climate change. Indeed, significantly reducing current human numbers may be necessary in order to do so.” [9]

- In 2004, emeritus professor of physics at California State University, Roger Dittmann, stated that all policies related to Agenda 21 should be pursued with the aim of worldwide population reduction and population control. “The Big Die Off,” the professor eagerly added, “has already begun.” In order to facilitate such a massive “die-off,” the professor proposes (page 18) global governance to make sure the directives will be universally applied:[10]

- “University College’s Emeritus Professor John Guillebaud, patron of the UK-based “Population Matters”, who depicted among other things a machine-gun, a hospital bed, and a knife dripping with blood, as examples of “natural” population control as opposed to “artificial” methods such as contraception and family planning.” [11]

Wired.com notes about the acid rain emergency: “In the 1980s it was acid rain’s turn to be the source of apocalyptic forecasts. In this case it was nature in the form of forests and lakes that would bear the brunt of human pollution. The issue caught fire in Germany, where a cover story in the news magazine *Der Spiegel* in November 1981 screamed: “the forest dies.” Not to be outdone, *Stern* magazine declared that a third of Germany’s forests were already dead or dying. Bernhard Ulrich, a soil scientist at the University of Göttingen, said it was already too late for the country’s forests: “They cannot be saved.” Forest death, *orwaldsterben*, became a huge story across Europe. “The forests and lakes are dying. Already the damage may be irreversible,” journalist Fred Pearce wrote in *New Scientist* in 1982. It was much the same in North America: Half of all US lakes were said to be becoming dangerously acidified, and forests from Virginia to central Canada were thought to be suffering mass die-offs of trees.

Conventional wisdom has it that this fate was averted by prompt legislative action to reduce sulphur dioxide emissions from power plants. That account is largely false. There was no net loss of forest in the 1980s to reverse. In the US, a 10-year government-sponsored study involving some 700 scientists and costing about \$500 million reported in 1990 that “there is no evidence of a general or unusual decline of forests in the United States and Canada due to acid rain” and “there is no case of forest decline in which acidic deposition is known to be a predominant cause.” In Germany, Heinrich Spiecker, director of the Institute for Forest Growth, was commissioned by a Finnish forestry organization to assess the health of European forests. He concluded that they were growing faster and healthier than ever and had been improving throughout the 1980s.

“Since we began measuring the forest more than 100 years ago, there’s never

been a higher volume of wood ... than there is now,” Spiecker said. (Ironically, one of the chief ingredients of acid rain—nitrogen oxide—breaks down naturally to become nitrate, a fertilizer for trees.) As for lakes, it turned out that their rising acidity was likely caused more by reforestation than by acid rain; one study suggested that the correlation between acidity in rainwater and the pH in the lakes was very low. The story of acid rain is not of catastrophe averted but of a minor environmental nuisance somewhat abated.[12]

The “ozone hole” has had a similar history to acid rain. Perhaps it was ameliorated by banning CFCs—and perhaps not. We still get the ozone hole every spring in the Antarctic, about the same size. Scientists debate why, but there is no conclusion. It could be that chemicals are taking longer to disintegrate; or the issue could have been misdiagnosed in the beginning. As with global warming, by all means, examine the facts. *But do not use science as a dishonest tool to achieve some social or political ends.* This is what my paper is all about.

Some the environmental apocalyptic thought for the current generation can be traced to Rachel Carson’s book *Silent Spring*. Certainly, an analysis of this book as an antecedent to the global warming planks would be well warranted; however, it is outside the scope of this paper. Suffice to say, however, that—while there are valid questions to be asked about the nature of technology in today’s world—Luddite-ism is not a viable path... unless, of course, we drastically reduce population. It is the author’s own opinion that much of what we see in environmentalism is basically a Christian heresy—viz; man trying to expiate his own “environmental sins” by engaging in financial self-flagellation. Note: this does not mean mankind is not a steward of the earth. We indeed are. This also does not mean that we shouldn’t examine scientifically the impact of our actions. It *does mean* that the religion of environmentalism is, for all practical purposes, a cult.

Worse—ignoring the example set in CS Lewis’ “That Hideous Strength” - organizers of such groups as Planet Under Pressure think we have now entered the “Anthropocene” —an era where man, not natural conditions—will drive our geological and meteorological processes. Martin Rees of the Royal Society stated “This century is special in the Earth’s history. It is the first when one species—ours—has the planet’s future in its hands... We’ve invented a new geological era: the Anthropocene.” [13]

Yes... just like the dot-com wunderkinds told us before the 2000 bust, we have entered a “new era.” The reality? That mankind’s essential *nature* has not changed. The fact is, that we still do not know who will control the controllers. And the fact is, there is no global warming.

¹ Case in point: Global Security.org reported 7/11/2011, re. the Iranian nuclear programme, “unnamed diplomatic and intelligence sources, the newspaper said former Soviet nuclear expert Vyacheslav Danilenko “allegedly tutored Iranians over

several years on building high-precision detonators of the kind used to trigger a nuclear chain reaction.” Science for power and money.globalsecurity.org Similarly, anticipating ClimateGate, Soren Kierkegaard noted “in the end, all corruption will come about as a consequence of the natural sciences.”

² Online at royalsociety.org

³ guardian.co.uk

⁴ portal.unesco.org

⁵ uonews.uoregon.edu See also prisonplanet.com

⁶ springerlink.com

⁷ erb.umich.edu

⁸ See econlib.org or american_almanac.tripod.com;

⁹ onlinelibrary.wiley.com

¹⁰ thedailysheep.com

¹¹ thedailysheep.com

¹² wired.com

¹³ google.com